

Exhibit E

Exhibit E

ROBINS, KAPLAN, MILLER & CIRESI L.L.P.
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
LOS ANGELES

ROBINS, KAPLAN, MILLER & CIRESI L.L.P.
Roman M. Silberfeld, Bar No. 62783
RMSilberfeld@rkmc.com
Bernice Conn, Bar No. 161594
Bconn@rkmc.com
David Martinez, Bar No. 193183
DMartinez@rkmc.com
2049 Century Park East, Suite 3400
Los Angeles, CA 90067-3208
Telephone: 310-552-0130
Facsimile: 310-229-5800

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

BEST BUY CO., INC.; BEST BUY
PURCHASING LLC; BEST BUY ENTERPRISE
SERVICES, INC.; BEST BUY STORES, L.P.;
BESTBUY.COM, LLC; MAGNOLIA HI-FI, INC.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

IN RE: CATHODE RAY TUBE (CRT)
ANTITRUST LITIGATION

Master File No. M:07-5994-SC
MDL No. 1917

This Document Relates to
Individual Case No. 3:11-cv-05513-SC

Case No. 3:11-cv-05513-SC

BEST BUY CO., INC.; BEST BUY
PURCHASING LLC; BEST BUY
ENTERPRISE SERVICES, INC.; BEST BUY
STORES, L.P.; BESTBUY.COM, L.L.C.; and
MAGNOLIA HI-FI, INC.,

**BEST BUY'S OBJECTIONS AND
RESPONSES TO DEFENDANT LG
ELECTRONICS U.S.A., INC.'S
THIRD SET OF
INTERROGATORIES**

Plaintiffs,

v.

HITACHI, LTD.; HITACHI DISPLAYS,
LTD.; HITACHI AMERICA, LTD.; HITACHI
ASIA, LTD.; HITACHI ELECTRONIC
DEVICES (USA), INC.; SHENZHEN SEG
HITACHI COLOR DISPLAY DEVICES,
LTD.; IRICO GROUP CORPORATION;
IRICO GROUP ELECTRONICS CO., LTD.;
IRICO DISPLAY DEVICES CO., LTD.; LG
ELECTRONICS, INC.; LG ELECTRONICS
USA, INC.; LG ELECTRONICS TAIWAN
TAIPEI CO., LTD.; LP DISPLAYS
INTERNATIONAL LTD.;

(CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE)

ROBINS, KAPLAN, MILLER & CIRESI L.L.P.
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
LOS ANGELES

PANASONIC CORPORATION;
PANASONIC CORPORATION OF NORTH
AMERICA; MT PICTURE DISPLAY CO.,
LTD.; BEIJING
MATSUSHITA COLOR CRT CO., LTD.;
KONINKLIJKE PHILIPS ELECTRONICS
N.V.; PHILIPS ELECTRONICS NORTH
AMERICA CORPORATION; PHILIPS
ELECTRONICS INDUSTRIES (TAIWAN),
LTD.; PHILIPS DA AMAZONIA
INDUSTRIA ELECTRONICA LTDA.;
SAMTEL COLOR LTD.; THAI CRT CO.,
LTD.; TOSHIBA CORPORATION; TOSHIBA
AMERICA, INC.; TOSHIBA AMERICA
CONSUMER PRODUCTS, LLC; TOSHIBA
AMERICA ELECTRONIC COMPONENTS,
INC.; TOSHIBA AMERICA INFORMATION
SYSTEMS, INC.; CHUNGHWA PICTURE
TUBES, LTD.; CHUNGHWA PICTURE
TUBES (MALAYSIA); TATUNG COMPANY
OF AMERICA, INC.,

Defendants.

PROPOUNDING PARTIES: LG ELECTRONICS U.S.A., INC.

RESPONDING PARTY: BEST BUY CO., INC.; BEST BUY PURCHASING
LLC; BEST BUY ENTERPRISE SERVICES, INC.;
BEST BUY STORES, L.P.; BESTBUY.COM, L.L.C.;
and MAGNOLIA HI-FI, INC.

SET NO.: THREE

TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR COUNSEL OF RECORD:

Pursuant to Rules 26 and 33 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Plaintiffs Best
Buy Co., Inc.; Best Buy Purchasing LLC; Best Buy Enterprise Services, Inc., Best Buy
Stores, L.P.; BestBuy.Com, L.L.C.; and Magnolia HI-FI, Inc. (collectively "Best Buy")
hereby Object and Respond to Defendant LG Electronics U.S.A., Inc.'s Third Set of
Interrogatories (hereinafter, the "Requests").

GENERAL OBJECTIONS

1. Best Buy responds without prejudice to its rights to use or introduce at later
times in this proceeding, subsequently discovered information or information omitted
from these responses.

2. Best Buy objects to the Requests to the extent they call for the disclosure of information that is subject to the attorney-client privilege, joint prosecution privilege, the work product doctrine, or any other applicable privilege, immunity, or protection.

3. Best Buy objects to the Requests to the extent that they require Best Buy to disclose the confidential, proprietary, or commercially sensitive information of third parties that Best Buy is bound, contractually or otherwise, not to disclose.

4. Best Buy objects to the Requests to the extent that they: (i) seek information that is neither relevant to the parties' claims and defenses in this litigation nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence; (ii) are vague, indefinite, or ambiguous; (iii) are unduly burdensome or unreasonably broad; (iv) are unreasonably cumulative or duplicative; or (v) seek information that is already in Defendants' possession, custody, control, or which is publicly available or otherwise readily accessible to Defendants.

5. Best Buy objects to the Requests, including the Instructions and Definitions, to the extent that they purport to impose upon Best Buy obligations beyond those imposed by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

6. Best Buy objects to the Requests to the extent that they are premature. Best Buy has not completed its discovery and investigation in this matter, which is ongoing. Best Buy responds after reasonable inquiry into the relevant facts based only upon presently known information and documentation. Further investigation and discovery, including further review of documents produced or to be produced by Defendants, may result in the identification of additional information. Best Buy's responses should not be construed to prejudice Best Buy's right to conduct further investigation in this case or to limit Best Buy's use of any evidence that may be later developed.

7. Best Buy objects to the extent Defendants are drawing a distinction between CRTs and CRT Products. Best Buy interprets all requests related to CRTs to include its purchases of CRT Products, which contain CRTs.

8. Best Buy objects to the Requests to the extent that they prematurely seek

expert opinion, and reserves the right to supplement, clarify, revise, or correct any or all responses to such requests, and to assert additional objections or privileges in accordance with the time period for exchanging expert reports.

Best Buy objects to the Requests in their entirety on the above grounds. In order to avoid repetition, the foregoing General Objections are hereby incorporated into each response as if set forth therein.

OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO INTERROGATORIES

Interrogatory No. 19:

If YOUR response to any LG Electronics U.S.A., Inc.'s First Set of Requests for Admission to Best Buy was anything other than an unqualified admission, separately for each Request for Admission:

- a. state the number of the request for admission;
- b. state all facts upon which YOU base YOUR response;
- c. IDENTIFY all EVIDENCE upon which YOU intend to rely to support YOUR response; and
- d. IDENTIFY each PERSON who has knowledge of the facts upon which YOU base YOUR response.

Response:

Best Buy refers to and incorporates its General Objections to these Interrogatories, as well as its specific objections to Requests for Admission Nos. 1 through 65, as if fully restated here. Best Buy specifically objects to this Interrogatory to the extent it calls for information that is already in the possession, custody, or control of LGEUSA and has not yet been provided to Best Buy. Best Buy also objects to this Interrogatory, in combination with the accompanying Request for Admissions served simultaneously, as improperly requiring Best Buy to marshal all evidence and "state its case" in responses to written discovery. Best Buy additionally objects to this Interrogatory as requiring the attribution of a particular action to a specific LG entity when all of the LG entities named as defendants were owned and controlled and acted pursuant to the overall strategy and

1 direction of LG Electronics, Inc.

2 Best Buy further objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that: (i) it is overly
3 broad, unduly burdensome, and premature as it requires Best Buy to review and
4 analyze all information obtained in discovery thus far and state their entire case on an
5 incomplete record; (ii) depending on LG's intent, it may call for a legal conclusion; (iii) it
6 is duplicative of other discovery propounded by Defendants in MDL No. 1917; (iv) it
7 seeks information that is the subject of ongoing discovery and investigation; (v) it seeks
8 information that is equally available to LG; and (vi) it seeks, in contravention to well-
9 established legal principles, to dismember the overall conspiracy to focus on its separate
10 parts, instead of looking at it as a whole, *see In re CRT Antitrust Litigation*, Master Docket
11 No. 3:07-cv-05944sc, Recommended Order of the Special Master, dated August 15, 2014,
12 ("If 'compartmentalizing' an alleged conspiracy at trial or on summary judgment motion
13 is not appropriate, still less is it appropriate in discovery"); *Continental Ore Co. v. Union*
14 *Carbide & Carbon Corp.*, 370 U.S. 690, 699 (1962); *see also Beltz Travel Service, Inc. v. Int'l Air*
15 *Trans. Assoc.*, 620 F.2d 1360, 1366-67 (9th Cir. 1980) (citing *United States v. Patten*, 226 U.S.
16 525, 544 (1913)), and improperly seeks "to carve the alleged conspiracy into a number of
17 mini-conspiracies." *In re TFT-LCD (Flat Panel) Antitrust Litigation*, Master Docket No.
18 M:07-1827-SI, Order Denying Defendants' Motions for Partial Summary Judgment
19 Regarding Production and Capacity, Docket No. 4097, at 1-2.

20 Best Buy further objects to the extent LGEUSA has exceeded the limit set forth by
21 Fed. R. Civ. P. 33. Interrogatories that ask the "responding party to state the facts,
22 identify witnesses, or identify documents supporting the denial of each request for
23 admission contained in a set of requests for admissions" should be construed as
24 containing a subpart for each request for admission. *See Safeco Ins. Co. of Am. v. Rawstron*,
25 181 F.R.D. 441, 447 (C.D. Cal. 1998) ("Allowing service of an interrogatory which
26 requests disclosure of all information on which the denials of each of 50 requests for
27 admission were based . . . essentially transforms each request for admission into an
28 interrogatory. This is not the purpose requests for admissions were intended to serve,

1 and because Rule 36 imposes no numerical limit on the number of requests for
2 admissions that may be served, condoning such a practice would circumvent the
3 numerical limit contained in Rule 33(a)."); *see also* Local Rules 33-2 and 36-2.

4 Subject to and without waiving their general and specific objections, Best Buy
5 states that the documents and transactional data that they produced in this litigation
6 shall be deemed produced in response to this Interrogatory, subject to the Responses
7 and Objections contained herein. Best Buy further states that the response to this
8 Interrogatory may include the transactional data and documents produced by
9 Defendants, co-conspirators, and third parties in MDL No. 1917. The burden of
10 identifying specific documents responsive to this Interrogatory from review of the
11 documents and data identified in this response is substantially the same for either Best
12 Buy or LG.

13 Best Buy further refers LG to:

14 The documents produced in this litigation listed by Dell, Inc. in its response to
15 Interrogatory No. 2 of its Responses to Defendants Samsung SDI America, Inc. and LG
16 Electronics, USA, Inc.'s First Set of Interrogatories dated January 13, 2014.

17 Expert report of Dr. Kenneth G. Elzinga dated April 15, 2014 and accompanying
18 materials.

19 Expert Report of Dr. Kenneth G. Elzinga dated August 5, 2014 and accompanying
20 materials.

21 Philips' Supplemental and Second Supplemental Responses to Direct Purchaser
22 Plaintiffs' First Set of Interrogatories, Nos. 4 and 5.

23 Hitachi Displays, Ltd.'s Supplemental Response to Direct Purchaser Plaintiffs' First
24 Set of Interrogatories, No. 5.

25 Hitachi Electronic Devices (USA), Inc.'s Supplemental and Second Supplemental
26 Response to Direct Purchaser Plaintiffs' First Set of Interrogatories, No. 5.

27 Hitachi Electronic Devices (USA), Inc.'s Supplemental Responses to Sharp
28 Electronics Corporation and Sharp Electronics Manufacturing Company of America,

1 Inc.'s First Set of Interrogatories, Nos. 2 and 3.

2 Panasonic Corporation of North America, MT Picture Display Co., Ltd., and
3 Panasonic Corporation (f/k/a Matsushita Electric Industrial Co., Ltd.) Second and
4 Third Supplemental Responses and Objections to Direct Purchaser Plaintiffs' First Set of
5 Interrogatories.

6 LG Electronics, Inc.'s Supplemental and Second Supplemental Responses to Direct
7 Purchaser Plaintiffs' First Set of Interrogatories, Nos. 4 and 5.

8 Toshiba Corporation's Supplemental Objections and Responses to Interrogatory
9 Nos. 4 and 5 of Direct Purchaser Plaintiffs' First Set of Interrogatories.

10 Toshiba America Electronic Components, Inc.'s Supplemental Objections and
11 Responses to Interrogatory Nos. 4 and 5 of Direct Purchaser Plaintiffs' First Set of
12 Interrogatories.

13 Samsung SDI Defendants' Second Supplemental Responses to Direct Purchaser
14 Plaintiffs' First Set of Interrogatories Nos. 4 and 5.

15 Samsung SDI Co., Ltd.'s Responses to Dell Plaintiffs' First Set of Interrogatories,
16 dated Nov. 25, 2013.

17 Samsung SDI Co., Ltd.'s Responses to Dell Plaintiffs' First Set of Requests for
18 Admission, dated Nov. 25, 2013.

19 Samsung SDI Defendants' Responses to Direct Action Plaintiffs' First Set of
20 Interrogatories dated, May 12, 2010.

21 Korean Fair Trade Commission Report on the CRT Conspiracy.

22 The European Commission Report on the CRT Conspiracy.

23 Attachment A to Certain Direct Action Plaintiffs' Responses to Interrogatories
24 dated May 16, 2014.

25 Exhibit A to Best Buy's July 21, 2014 Objections and Responses to Defendants
26 Panasonic and LG Electronics USA's Second Set of Interrogatories.

27 Best Buy further states that discovery is on-going and reserves the right to
28 supplement or amend its responses.

ROBINS, KAPLAN, MILLER & CIRESI L.L.P.
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
LOS ANGELES

DATED: August 21, 2014

ROBINS, KAPLAN, MILLER & CIRESI L.L.P.

By: /s/ Laura E. Nelson
Roman M. Silberfeld
David Martinez
Laura E. Nelson

ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFFS
BEST BUY CO., INC.; BEST BUY PURCHASING
LLC; BEST BUY ENTERPRISE SERVICES, INC.;
BEST BUY STORES, L.P.; BESTBUY.COM, LLC;
MAGNOLIA HI-FI, INC.